

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/715,374	11/19/2003	Jean-Francois Lafon	245516US41X DIV	5478
22850 7:	590 06/18/2004		EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPI	VAK, MCCLELLAND	TRAN, DALENA		
1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ALLEM INDICE	i, vii 22311		3661	
			DATE MAILED: 06/18/200	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Applicati n No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/715,374	LAFON ET AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Dalena Tran	3661				
-	The MAILING DATE of this communication app						
Period fo	r Reply						
THE I - Exter after - If the - If NO - Failui Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. sions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of the to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply by within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS, cause the application to become ABAND	be timely filed) days will be considered timely. from the mailing date of this communication. ONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 N	ovember 2003.					
2a) <u></u> □	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.						
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	on of Claims						
4)🖂	Claim(s) <u>1-16</u> is/are pending in the application.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-16</u> is/are rejected.						
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8)[8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Applicati	on Papers						
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10)[10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) 🗌	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attached Of	fice Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of:		9(a)-(d) or (f).				
	1. Certified copies of the priority document		and an Ma				
	2. Certified copies of the priority document3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority						
		•	eived in this National Stage				
* S	application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachma-	vic)						
Attachment	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summ	nary (PTO-413)				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date							
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/19/04. 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 6) Other:							
. apei	1 apol 110(3)/iviali Date <u>a 13/01</u> . 0) □ Otiel						

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 1-04)

Art Unit: 3661

DETAILED ACTION

Notice to Applicant(s)

- 1. This application has been examined. Claims 1-16 are pending.
- 2. The prior art submitted on 2/19/04 has been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 1,3-8, and 10-12, are rejected under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being unpatentable over Bang et al. (5,715,163) in view of Snyder et al. (6,664,989).

As per claim 1, Bang et al. disclose a dialog method for dialog between an operator of an aircraft and at least one system of the aircraft, comprising the steps of: displaying on a display at least one window including a plurality of responsive objects respectively associated with one of multiple functions of the at least one system of the aircraft (see the abstract; and column 2, lines 53-67), and moving a cursor in a discrete manner on the display, responsive object by responsive object, so as to designate a responsive object (see column 1, line 48 to column 2, line 10; and column 5, lines 38-44). Bang et al. do not disclose moving a cursor in a continuous manner. However, Snyder et al. disclose moving a cursor in a continuous manner on the display so as to designate a responsive object (see the abstract; and column 6, lines 38-52). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teach of Bang et al. by combining moving a cursor in a continuous manner on the display for

continuously activate or deactivate menu selection in the display screen provide a faster rate of viewing and selection objects in the display.

As per claim 3, Bang et al. disclose activating a function associated with the responsive object designated by the step of moving a cursor in a discrete manner on the display (see column 4, lines 28-61). Bang et al. do not disclose activating a function associated with the responsive object designated by the step of moving a cursor in a continuous manner on the display. However, Snyder et al. disclose activating a function associated with the responsive object designated by the step of moving a cursor in a continuous manner on the display (see column 5, line 50 to column 6, line 9). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teach of Bang et al. by combining activating a function associated with the responsive object designated by the step of moving a cursor in a continuous manner on the display in order to execute a selection of the desired object.

Also, as per claim 4, Bang et al. disclose step of activating the function associated with the responsive object designated by the step of moving a cursor in a discrete manner on the display is performed with an Enter key on a keyboard (see column 3, lines 1-12). Bang et al. do not disclose moving a cursor in a continuous manner with a key on a mouse. However, Snyder et al. disclose step of activating the function associated with the responsive object designated by the step of moving a cursor in a continuous manner on the display is performed with a key on a mouse (see column 3, lines 8-13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teach of Bang et al. by combining activating the function associated with the responsive object in a continuous manner on the display with a key on a mouse for easily selection a desired command in the interface for the flight crew.

Art Unit: 3661

As per claim 5, Bang et al. do not disclose plurality of windows. However, Snyder et al. disclose the at least one window includes a plurality of windows, and moving the cursor discretely from one window to another window in the plurality of windows (see column 3, line

49 to column 4, line 13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teach of Bang et al. by combining plurality of

windows to provide multifunction communications between and operator and the aircraft system.

As per claim 6, Bang et al. do not disclose a default field. However, Snyder et al. disclose each window is divided into a plurality of fields each including at least one responsive object (see column 4, lines 32-65), and each window includes one default field on which the cursor arrives after moving from one window to another window (see column 4, lines 13-31). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teach of Bang et al. by combining each window includes one default field for easily to locate the cursor position and located an object being selected to view.

Also, as per claim 7, Snyder et al. disclose each default field includes one default responsive object (see column 4, lines 32-65).

As per claim 8, Bang et al. do not disclose a Tab key. However, Snyder et al. disclose step of moving one window to another window is performed with a Tab key on a keyboard (see column 4, lines 14-31). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teach of Bang et al. by combining moving one window to another window is performed with a Tab key on a keyboard for fast and conveniently select a desired window for viewing.

Art Unit: 3661

As per claim 10, Bang et al. disclose automatically moving the cursor to a responsive object via a single action by the operator (see column 3, lines 12-40).

As per claim 11, Bang et al. disclose moving the cursor in the discrete manner on the display with a keyboard (see column 3, lines 12-40). Bang et al. do not disclose moving a cursor in a continuous manner. However, Snyder et al. disclose moving a cursor in a continuous manner on the display with a mouse (see column 3, lines 8-13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teach of Bang et al. by combining moving a cursor in a continuous manner on the display for continuously activate or deactivate menu selection in the display screen provide a faster rate of viewing and selection objects in the display.

As per claim 12, Bang et al. disclose moving the cursor in the discrete manner on the display moves the cursor discretely on the display, responsive object by responsive object, in a cyclical manner (see column 4, line 62 to column 5, line 44; and column 6, lines 6-40).

5. Claim 2, is rejected under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being unpatentable over Bang et al. (5,715,163), and Snyder et al. (6,664,989) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Houlberg (6,172,747).

As per claim 2, Snyder et al. disclose moving the cursor in the continuous manner on the display with a control ball on a mouse (see column 3, lines 8-13). Bang et al., and Snyder et al. do not disclose an arrow key on a keyboard. However, Houlberg discloses moving the cursor in the discrete manner on the display with an arrow key on a keyboard (see column 11, lines 12-15). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teach of Bang et al., and Snyder et al. by combining moving the cursor

Art Unit: 3661

in the discrete manner on the display with an arrow key on a keyboard allow the operator to skip through plurality of screen display with convenient and faster rate.

6. Claim 9, is rejected under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being unpatentable over Bang et al. (5,715,163), and Snyder et al. (6,664,989) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Beeks (6,104,969).

As per claim 9, Bang et al., and Snyder et al. do not disclose moving the cursor in the discrete manner on the display is activated during an emergency mode of the aircraft. However, Beeks discloses moving the cursor in the discrete manner on the display is activated during an emergency mode of the aircraft (see the abstract; and column 1, line 65 to column 2, line 12). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teach of Bang et al., and Snyder et al. by combining moving the cursor in the discrete manner on the display is activated during an emergency mode of the aircraft to provide an operator ability to accurately manipulate a cursor location during periods of erratic vehicle moment that is easily to place the cursor in an unintended location of the display.

7. Claims 13-16, are rejected under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being unpatentable over Bang et al. (5,715,163), and Snyder et al. (6,664,989) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Muller et al. (6,072,473).

As per claim 13, Bang et al., and Snyder et al. do not disclose plurality of displays. However, Muller et al. disclose the display includes a plurality of displays, and moving the cursor from one display to another display in the plurality of displays (see column 4, line 58 to column 5, line 39; and column 6, lines 62-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teach of Bang et al., and Snyder

Art Unit: 3661

et al. by combining plurality of displays so the pilot and co-pilot in the airplane easy to view and interact with the system.

As per claim 14, Snyder et al. disclose each window includes a plurality of windows, each window is divided into a plurality of fields each including at least one responsive object (see column 4, lines 13-31), and each display includes one default field on which the cursor arrives after moving from one window to another window (see column 3, line 49 to column 4, line 13).

As per claim 15, Snyder et al. disclose the cursor is moved from one display to another display via one of a key on a mouse and a key on a keyboard (see column 3, lines 8-13).

As per claim 16, Bang et al., and Snyder et al. do not disclose eight displays. However, it is obvious one can design a plurality of display for use by the pilot and the co-pilot. For example, Muller et al. disclose six displays (see column 3, line 36 to column 4, line 5), it is obvious that screens 7-10 can used by each of the pilots, central screen 11 can common used by each of the pilots. Therefore, it is obvious that the display can included eight displays, of which three displays are for a pilot of the aircraft, three other displays are for the co-pilot, and two displays are for common use by the pilot and co-pilot.

Conclusion

- 8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:
 - . Oder et al. (5,519,392)
 - . Briffe et al. (6,057,786)
 - . Bomans et al. (6,094,608)

Application/Control Number: 10/715,374 Page 8

Art Unit: 3661

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Dalena Tran whose telephone number is 703-308-8223. The

examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:30 AM-5:30 PM), off every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Thomas Black can be reached on 703-305-8233. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Patent Examiner
Dalena Tran

Dalenatram

June 10, 2004